

California State Auditor response to questions regarding RFP#2009-02.

1. Is there an anticipated budget amount on this RFP?

At this time, the State Auditor has not received funding for outreach, therefore, budget information is currently unavailable.

2. You mention “translation services” in your new RFP. Do you have a minimum number of languages for which translation services should be applied?

No. The State Auditor recognizes that a viable outreach process for the Voters First Act will require the translation of material into multiple languages through a variety of sources. Bidders shall propose the translation services necessary to implement their proposed plans. The cost of the services must be stated.

3. Do you have a specific list of materials you will need translation services? For example, what about your Web site?

Translation services needed by the State Auditor will be handled by her staff. This includes any translations needed for her website. If specific translations are required for the website under a bidder’s proposal, the bidder would be required to provide the translations and to incorporate those costs into the proposal.

4. Are there companies that did not participate in the rejected RFP that are part of the new RFP?

RFP #2009-02 was opened to all bidders identically to the first RFP. Therefore, there is a possibility of new companies participating in the new process. We will not know definitively until the deadline for submitting the RFP’s.

5. Are we limited to only updating the strategies we presented in the first RFP or do we have free reign to append –including costs?

There are no restrictions on the new proposals. All facets of any prior proposal may be re-written and the costs can be recalculated to reflect any changes. A new RFP review committee has been named and the process will be handled completely apart from the first RFP review.

6. Outside of the State Auditor’s office, are there any other resources available for use in the outreach program (such as other agencies, designated spokespeople, websites, etc)?

The State Auditor is the sole state agency responsible for the outreach process as it pertains to the selection of the commission. Other state and local agencies may have resources that can be used by a vendor in their outreach services. However, it

is up to each proposer to determine what resources are available and how they would be used in the context of their proposal.

7. Besides political party affiliation, what criteria and/or qualifications will the Auditor's office be seeking in commission applicants?

The Voters First Act (act) lists the qualification criteria for the commission's applicants. In addition, the act states that commissioners "shall be created on the basis of relevant analytical skills, ability to be impartial, and the appreciation for California's diverse demographics and geography." The State Auditor intends to use these requirements as the criteria for the selection of the commissioners.

8. This question concerns two inconsistencies found in RFP#2009-02: First, Attachment F calls for the cost proposal to be submitted separately but on page 9 of 2009-02, paragraph 6 says technical merit and cost sections should be submitted together. Which directive is correct? Secondly, on page 16 in Attachment B paragraphs 4b and 4c are in conflict. 4b says contractor is responsible for all travel expenses; 4c says State will pay for travel. Which is correct?

Regarding your first question, you may submit the technical merit and cost sections together. The two sections will be evaluated at the same time.

Regarding your second question, if a prospective contractor is proposing an outreach plan that will include travel expenses and the prospective contractor expects to be reimbursed for these expenses, the prospective contractor must include these expenses in the submitted proposal. If the proposal is selected, the State Auditor will authorize any travel expenses she deems necessary and appropriate to implement the outreach plan. Travel not specifically authorized by the State Auditor, in writing, will not be reimbursed.

9. Can you please let us know the status of the California State Auditor's office negotiations with the legislature for securing funds for this project?

At this time, the State Auditor still has not received funding for outreach. The legislature continues to hold budget hearings with state agencies.

10. The first amendment to the previous RFP specified dates for both, "Evaluation Completed" and "Intent to Award Posted." The revised RFP does not provide this information. Has the Auditor's office determined dates for these milestones?

Page 7, Section II, of RFP #2009-02 states:

Evaluation Completed	12 p.m.	5/19/2009
Intent to Award Notice posted*	9 a.m.	5/21/2009

These are the timelines that will be followed.

11. In the RFP #2009-02 issued on April 30, there are references to RFP #2009-01 throughout. I'd like to know if all bids submitted under RFP #2009-02 run the risk of being rejected due to references to the old RFP?

There is one reference in Section II, #4, Questions, in the address line and in the header to each page. As long as each RFP reference #2009-02 and responds to the requirements of RFP #2009-02, there is no risk of the RFP being rejected based on these references.

12. What is the budget for this project?

At this time, the State Auditor has not received funding for outreach, therefore, budget information is currently unavailable

13. What is the acceptable budget range for this project?

The RFP states: "Each proposal to provide outreach services should include a detailed plan for the most economical level of services that each contractor believes is necessary to provide a basic level of outreach to the State's eligible voters, including, but not limited to, voters in underserved communities, to make such voters aware of the opportunity to serve on the commission. In addition, each contractor is encouraged to provide one enhanced version to their basic level of outreach for the provision of services that the contractor believes would significantly increase outreach to voters at a reasonable cost." Each proposer must determine an acceptable budget range within these contexts.

14. What constitutes "reasonable cost" as stated on page 4, Section 1, Paragraph 2, 4th line from the bottom page?

The State Auditor is seeking a Statewide Outreach Plan that is capable of meeting the requirements of the act by soliciting the broadest public participation possible for the redistricting process at the lowest reasonable rate.

15. How many people have expressed interest in applying for or regarding the Citizens Redistricting Commission as a result of the announcement in the May 19 Special Election Voter Pamphlet?

Thirty-five individuals have responded specifically to the voter pamphlet. All 35 have requested specific notification when the application process begins. Calls continue daily.

16. How many people have expressed interest in applying for or regarding Citizens Redistricting Commission as a result of the Interested Persons Meetings conducted throughout the state earlier this year? No separate statistic was maintained. See 17 below.

17. How many people to date have expressed interest in applying for or regarding the Citizens Redistricting Commission?

Four hundred and eighteen (418) individuals have requested to be on our Person's of Interest list. Approximately 312 (75%) of those individuals have requested to be informed about the application date to apply to be a commissioner.

18. On page 34, Attachment F, there is a reference to Attachment 4, the Small Business and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Requirements and Forms. Is this the same as what is mentioned and required as part of Attachment 2 (which is also listed on page 34, Attachment F)?

Yes.

19. Regarding the Cost Proposal, on page 10, subparagraph g., how much level of detail is needed? Are you seeking a full narrative and detail of the task to be performed or is all that narrative to be contained in Part I, the Responsive Materials, proposal?

As stated in the proposal, the cost proposal should contain specific description of each task to be performed, both for the basic plan and the enhanced plan including a cost line for each task that details who will perform the task, the primary contractor or a sub-contractor, the frequency of the task, the total number of hours for the task, when applicable, and the total costs associated with the task. With regards to the frequency of a task, if the task is ongoing such as an administrative function, state as such. If the task is to be recurring, such as a series of meetings or workshops, state the number of times that the function will occur based on the cost estimate. Each proposal should be assembled in a manner that allows easy identification of the cost for any proposed segment of the outreach plan.

20. Will those who have submitted a Letter of Intent be posted on the bsa.ca.gov Web site?

Yes.

21. Are other companies who didn't submit a proposal for RFP #2009-01 now able to participate in RFP #2009-02?

Yes. See #4, above.